S. HRG. 98-239

SMALL WATERSHED PROJECTS OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JULY 12, 1983

Printed for the use of the Committee on Environment and Public Works

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

23-832 O WASHINGTON : 1983

S321-32.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont, *Chairman*

HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., Tennessee
JOHN H. CHAFEE, Rhode Island
ALAN K. SIMPSON, Wyoming
JAMES ABDNOR, South Dakota
STEVE SYMMS, Idaho
PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
LLOYD BENTSEN, Texas
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota
GARY HART, Colorado
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, New York
GEORGE J. MITCHELL, Maine
MAX BAUCUS, Montana

BAILEY GUARD, *Staff Director*
JOHN W. YAGO, JR., *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES

JAMES ABDNOR, South Dakota, *Chairman*

PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire

DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, New York
LLOYD BENTSEN, Texas
MAX BAUCUS, Montana

CONTENTS

Page

Abdnor, Hon. James, U.S. Senator from the State of South Dakota, opening statement of 1

WITNESSES

de la Garza, Hon E, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas 11
Prepared statement 50
Kasich, Hon. John R., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio 4
Prepared statement 15
Long, Bruce, Commissioner, Douglas County, Oreg 6
Prepared statement 18
Miller, Hon. Clarence, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio 3
Nelson, Edgar H., Director, Basin and Area Planning Division, Soil Conservation Service, accompanied by Edward G. Riekert, Assistant Director, Basin and Area Planning Division, Soil Conservation Service 8
Responses to written questions 39
Postle, Gordon, Secretary-Treasurer, South Licking Conservancy District, accompanied by Ed Hankinson, President; John Weaver, Board Member; and Wendell Hartshorn, Board Member 5
Prepared statement 16
Slattery, Hon. Jim, a Representative in Congress from the State of Kansas 12
Symms, Hon. Steve, U.S. Senator from the State of Idaho 1
Weaver, Hon. James, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon 8
Prepared statement 23

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Projects, descriptions of:
Brundage Watershed, Idaho 25
Elk Creek Watershed, Kans 28
South Fork Licking River Watershed, Ohio 31
Calapooya Creek Watershed, Oreg 34
Los Olmos Creek Watershed, Tex 37
Statements:
Kassebaum, Hon. Nancy, U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas 54
Calapooya Water Control District 21
Delaware Watershed Joint District No. 10 56

SMALL WATERSHED PROJECTS OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

TUESDAY, JULY 12, 1983

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 2 p.m., in room SD-406, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. James Abdnor (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Abdnor and Bentsen.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ABDNOR, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Senator ABDNOR. The hearing will come to order.

It is a pleasure to be here today to receive testimony on five Soil Conservation Service small watershed projects. This subcommittee has the responsibility to review these projects and make recommendations regarding their authorization to the Committee on the Environment and Public Works. Since these projects are authorized by resolution of the full committee rather than by the full Senate, our responsibility is especially great.

After our hearing today and after further review the subcommittee will make every effort to consider these projects and markup within a few weeks. The hearing record will be held open for at least 2 weeks for those wishing to submit statements or additional material concerning these projects. We are pleased to have with us today some of our colleagues from the House of Representatives and the Senate as well as witnesses from Ohio and Oregon.

The subcommittee extends to all of you a warm welcome. We are really happy to see Congressman Miller. It is like old times working with you. We are happy to see you and all of the gentlemen that are here.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Senator ABDNOR. We will begin with a very important and valuable member of this committee, Senator Symms, who I think has a project of his own.

Senator Symms.

STATEMENT OF HON. STEVE SYMMS, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Senator SYMMS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to join with you in welcoming Congressman Miller and Congressman Kasich. I remember you and I standing many times with Clarence Miller on the floor of the House, sometimes when there weren't too many of us but our opponents seem to be growing in numbers these days. We are at least getting a little more social credibility, Clarence, and we are glad to have you come over to this side and you certainly add to our side of the Hill to have you over here.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Steve.

Senator SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for your very quick action to my request for the subcommittee hearings on the Brundage watershed project. I couldn't ask for greater cooperation which you extend to me and I want to thank you for it.

The Brundage watershed project is so small in its dollar amount that it is about one-thousandth of a billion dollars and yet to the Idaho farmers that has been so closely involved in this project it is a very important undertaking that deserves the attention of this subcommittee. This is one of those projects that is about approximately 50 percent funded by the Government and 50 percent funded by the farmers who will be using the water. So I think that this is one time where we get good conservation, good watershed protection, and good storage capability. The public and the farmers will certainly benefit from this project.

I have personally been involved in this project since early 1981 and earlier than that with the Idahoans who live in Meadow Valley near New Meadows, Idaho. It has been a truly frustrating experience for the team that has been responsible for this project because the yeoman's work that has been done has been mired in the bowels of the OMB. Seldom have I been as blunt with this administration as I have been with my numerous communications with OMB Director, David Stockman, former colleague of ours in the House, and despite assurances it would proceed smoothly the small and routine project was fraught with the same time of action we became used to in the Carter administration.

The project was initiated several years ago when the U.S. Forest Service determined that the existing dam and reservoir was unsafe and had to be breeched or rebuilt to insure public safety. Breeching the dam would have exacerbated the situation regarding the livestock. In short, the ranchers could not continue their current practices without an insured supply of water from the Brundage Reservoir. The project coupled with the economic need for an overhaul of local land practices with that of fish enhancement, wetlands protection and structural improvements to the dam's storage capacity and headgates.

It is an excellent plan devised with the cooperative efforts of the local soil conservation district, the Idaho Fish and Game Department, the Brundage Water Users Association, the Goose Creek Canal Co., and the South End Ditch Co. The average annual benefits of the project will exceed the cost by 1.4 to 1. Although I had hoped we could resolve this issue quickly and obtain a construction start in time for significant action this year, especially with the climatic conditions in that area of Idaho, it was only a little over 2 months ago that OMB released it for congressional review. I intend to continue my efforts to see this project to an expeditious solution

and I appreciate the chairman's speedy action scheduling these hearings.

Mr. Chairman, we will submit material that you deem necessary on the technical aspects of the project for the committee hearing record or for the committee file. I will yield my time back so you may proceed with your other witnesses.

I know the chairman has a markup in the Appropriations Committee.

Senator ABDNOR. Is there anyone else who wants to be heard on the Brundage Watershed?

Senator ABDNOR. Thank you, Senator Symms.

We have kept our two distinguished Congressmen and the others waiting here, Congressmen Kasich and Miller. I don't know which one of you wants to go first. You are all here on this one project. You may introduce the rest of the panel. Are you all here for the South Fork?

Mr. MILLER. That is correct, the South Fork Licking River watershed project.

Senator ABDNOR. Very good.

Congressman, you go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF HON. CLARENCE MILLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Jim.

We know that you have a markup in another committee. We will move along rather hurriedly.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure today to appear before this distinguished subcommittee to underscore my support for, and interest in, the approval of the South Fork Licking watershed project.

I am pleased to join my colleague from Ohio, Representative John Kasich, and the officers of the South Licking Watershed Conservancy District, in endorsing this important project and in encouraging the subcommittee to approve without delay a resolution of authorization.

I would like to take a moment, if I may, to introduce the district officials who have been the driving force behind this project. These gentlemen have worked diligently for well over a decade to make the project a reality. The officials joining us today are: Ed Hankinson, president of the Board of Directors of the South Licking Watershed Conservancy District; Mr. John Weaver, and Wendall Hartshorn, board members of the district. Gordon Postle is secretary/treasurer of the board.

The project being considered by the subcommittee is in response to a history of widespread flooding along the Licking River. Unchecked flooding and the loss of valuable property led local officials to form the South Licking Conservancy District in 1969.

The project under consideration today will provide the flood control long sought and so greatly needed along the south fork of the Licking River. Altogether, 180,364 acres of land are involved in the project. Project plans call for the construction of two flood control/recreational dams, stream channelization and obstruction removal.

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that widespread support for the project has been in evidence for years.

Let me quote from a May 27, 1983, editorial from the Newark (Ohio) Advocate:

> We believe the benefits of the project far outweigh any further concerns the conservancy might have. The project will contribute greatly to the safety of landowners along the waterways and for residents of downstream communities.

Authorization of the project is being sought under the provisions of the USDA's small watershed program and I feel, Mr. Chairman, that it fits the criteria of that very worthwhile program fully.

I would ask the subcommittee to approve the South Fork Licking plan for the benefit of those who are depending upon the blessings it will bring.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify on this important matter.

My colleague, Mr. Kasich, I am sure has remarks on the same project.

Senator ABDNOR. Congressman Kasich, we are happy to have you with us today.

Mr. KASICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator ABDNOR. You have great interest in this. You two gentlemen have made it very clear to us of the importance of this hearing today. It does a good job of setting the groundwork.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN R. KASICH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify before this committee for several reasons, but probably the most important one is I have been a long-term admirer of yours and appreciate the effort that you have been making here in the U.S. Senate on behalf of people not only of your State but also of the people who live within the State of Ohio.

It is a pleasure to appear with my distinguished colleague, Congressman Clarence Miller, before your subcommittee this afternoon, in support of the South Fork Licking River watershed project.

It is also my distinct pleasure to welcome the officers of the South Fork Licking Watershed Conservancy District, who have traveled to Washington to affirm their support in the project.

I may add one of our members has to get back to Ohio tonight so he can take some of his cattle a little bit east of Licking County. Their appearance here culminates over 14 years of careful planning and preparation for flood control projects and is a testament to the benefits it will provide to the citizens of Licking, Fairfield, and Percy Counties of Ohio.

As Mr. Miller pointed out, the project will affect 180,000 acres of land and will control serious flooding along Raccoon Creek in the South Fork of the Licking River. Plans call for extensive flood control measures and recreational improvements which will no doubt reduce crop damages, project residences, prevent further soil erosion and sediment damage and contribute greatly to the environmental quality of the area.

The project will have no effect or threaten endangered species or wetlands. Careful attention has been given to retaining the cultural and environmental resources by providing waterfowl and aquatic

habitats, acres of water for boating and fishing and land for other recreational facilities as well as the practical aspects of creating flood prevention benefits for over 450 homes and 35 businesses and reduction of water damage to the pasture and crop lands previously affected by continued flooding.

Stream erosion will be minimized by obstruction removal and watershed protection will be achieved through the application of planning and land treatment under an on-going program.

These are only a few of the benefits this project will establish for the citizens of these affected central Ohio communities and I know first-hand of the tremendous local interest in the construction of this project.

As you know, the plan being considered by the subcommittee today has been in the planning stages for many, many years, most important this proposal has been prepared under the provisions of the USDA small watershed program and has been refined with a new Federal cost benefit ratio guidelines.

I respectfully request the subcommittee's authorization for this project and I thank you for the time you have afforded me to testify.

If we have some time, Mr. Chairman, I am sure these gentlemen would just like a short time to talk.

Senator ABDNOR. You are my first duty here, even though I have other duties. We will put your statements in the record.

Mr. MILLER. We have Gordon Postle, secretary-treasurer and he has a statement for the record.

He may want to summarize that and, then, have that inserted for the official record.

Senator ABDNOR. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF GORDON POSTLE, SECRETARY-TREASURER, SOUTH LICKING CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, ACCOMPANIED BY ED HANKINSON, PRESIDENT; JOHN WEAVER, BOARD MEMBER; AND WENDELL HARTSHORN, BOARD MEMBER

Mr. POSTLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a pleasure for me to be here. The goals of the sponsors are to have flood water damage reduction for agricultural, commercial, industrial, and residential areas, erosion and sediment damage reduction, improve agricultural and water management, recreational area development, improved appearance of the natural environment and I would like to list the primary sponsors of the project and these sponsors have been in place supporting the project since the inception.

The South Licking Watershed Conservancy District, Licking County Soil and Water Conservation District, Fairfield County Soil and Conservation District, Perry County Soil and Water Conservation District, the Licking County Board of Commissioners, Fairfield County Board of Commissioners, Perry County Board of Commissioners and the Newark area Chamber of Commerce.

This project will reduce annual flooding damage within the watershed area $101,000 plus crops to pasture and related agricultural properties, almost $300,000 annual damage reductions to public transportation facilities, including Interstate Highway 70, which is

normally flooded at least twice each year, approximately 8,000 acres and 450 dwellings, 25 businesses that are affected by flooding will be protected.

Thank you, very much.

Senator ABDNOR. Thank you, Mr. Postle.

I want to say to Mr. Hartshorn, Mr. Hankinson, and Mr. Weaver, it is good you have come so far.

I know how important this project is to you. I am sure I need not tell you that Congressman Miller and Congressman Kasich have been working long and hard on it. We have the message. We know it is a fine project, the facts are all there.

We thank you, very much. I know you gentlemen want to get back and go to work.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator ABDNOR. The Calapooya Creek Watershed of Oregon, is next. We expect Congressman Weaver to be here. Do you want to wait for him?

STATEMENT OF BRUCE LONG, COMMISSIONER, DOUGLAS COUNTY, OREG.

Mr. LONG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I know that Congressman Weaver had anticipated and planned on being here today to testify. I am not sure if he is going to be here.

For purposes of the record my name is Bruce Long, Douglas County commissioner here today to testify on the Calapooya Creek project. Also I have brought with me written testimony from the Calapooya Water Control District which I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to place in the record.

Senator ABDNOR. Without objection, it will be made a part of the record.

Mr. LONG. Douglas County has been working to alleviate many of the water problems in our area since 1955 by virtually every winter we have flooding on the tributary creeks and streams only to be followed by water shortages during the summer. As a result of the problems that we had our county government has established a water resources department for the primary purposes of addressing and correcting these problems.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the Douglas County government is unique from most county governments in one respect. That is, we have not had an attitude of let the Federal Government do it. Instead we believe we should pull as much weight as possible. Four years ago we constructed a small reservoir about 30 miles south of the Calapooya with 11,750 acre feet of water storage in order to relieve critical municipal and agricultural water needs.

However, we have come to a point financially where we must ask for your help, at least in part, to construct the water impoundment in northern Douglas County. An integral part of our countywide water enhancement program requires completion of the Calapooya project. For more than 16 years we have worked with the SCS to bring this project to you today. Douglas County government has borne most of the costs to date for core drilling, aerial photography and hydrologic studies to insure that this water project is the best

investment in the Calapooya watershed. Presently there is a lack of available water for industrial and municipal growth in the northern part of our county. Over 60 percent of all irrigation in this area is discontinued each summer because of the water shortages. No longer is the Calapooya a major producer of summer anadromous fish because of extremely low flows which create deadly high water temperatures for fish life.

Although small, the 12,750-acre-foot Calapooya project will allow irrigation for farming for a distance of almost 18 miles downstream from the reservoir site. A total of 2,865 acres of farmland could be irrigated out of which 860 acres is classified as prime row crop soils. Since agriculture is our No. 2 industry, the increased production of farm crops from irrigation would bear significant economic results.

Besides its importance to the agricultural industry, water from this project is also needed to insure a reliable supply of both domestic and industrial water as well as revitalizing instream habitats for anadromous fish. Secondary purposes of the project, such as flood control, recreation, and land conservation further enhance the value of a water impoundment of the Calapooya. And, as the proposed watershed practices contained in this project are implemented, winter erosion of valuable farmlands will be greatly diminished.

A few years ago, Douglas County government funded an evaluation of three small SCS projects in Oregon for the purpose of examining the estimated benefits of Public Law 566 projects as compared to measured actual benefits, 10 years after project completion. I have also brought a copy of that study which I will leave for you. It is a very interesting study.

Senator ABDNOR. Fine. We would like to have that.

Mr. LONG. One finding of this study was that recreation is an excellent long-term investment for both the local sponsor and the Federal Government. Indeed, recreation of the type anticipated in the Calapooya project will provide jobs and a broader economic base in the northern part of Douglas County. Even though this project is heartily supported by our farmers, merchants, and general citizenry—with virtually no opposition from anyone—I have made this special trip to testify at your hearing simply for the purpose of emphasizing the importance of the Calapooya project to Douglas County. As you are aware, our local financial participation is approximately 58 percent of the project's costs. We are hopeful that today you will act favorably on the Soil Conservation Service's recommendations and fund the remaining 32 percent of the costs necessary to construct our much-needed Calapooya project.

I am happy to say Congressman Weaver has arrived to testify.

Senator ABDNOR. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Long. It is a very fine project as you said and as we can see. Our good friend, Congressman Weaver, from your State has arrived. I want you to know we were not going to shut you out. We knew we would keep Mr. Long testifying long enough for you to arrive.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES WEAVER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. WEAVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We miss you over there in the Longworth House Office Building.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that Commissioner Long has come back here emphasizes the importance of the project to Douglas County. I very rarely appear before this committee, as many of the projects that are proposed lack merit or are otherwise flawed. I have however devoted a great deal of my personal energy toward moving the Calapooya Dam through the Congress because the merits of this project are outstanding as Commissioner Long said.

It has strong approval by the community there and almost virtually no opposition.

Its costs are modest and appropriate. I have worked very closely developing the Soil Conservation Service's support for this project. As I say, Mr. Chairman, I have worked long and hard to obtain endorsement by the Office of Management and Budget and I strongly urge the committee to expenditiously join those of us who support this project and approve it as soon as possible.

I have just received a letter from Chairman Robert Roe of the Subcommittee on Water Resources saying that he will be taking up among other projects the Calapooya project immediately, and subcommittee action in the House on that area will be forthcoming.

I would like to just point out that the final EIS demonstrates that the Calapooya has a benign environmental impact and that the project has gained wide support by all people involved in Douglas County.

Senator ABDNOR. Mr. Youngquist is here?

Mr. LONG. Mr. Youngquist did arrive. He is not anticipating to testify.

Senator ABDNOR. Do you know if he has testimony?

Mr. LONG. No. He has no testimony.

Senator ABDNOR. Any of you are more than welcome to submit testimony in the next several days. Thank you.

Mr. WEAVER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator ABDNOR. Thank you, Congressman Weaver.

I think we are still waiting for Congressman Slattery and Congressman de la Garza. I wonder, if in the meantime, we could have Mr. Nelson, accompanied by Mr. Riekert to come up and discuss these projects. I am not trying to speed things along. But there are several places that we should all be. We will keep moving if we can.

We thank you for being willing to do this, to step up and finish quicker than you planned. I would appreciate your comments on the various projects.

STATEMENT OF EDGAR H. NELSON, DIRECTOR, BASIN AND AREA PLANNING DIVISION, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, ACCOMPANIED BY EDWARD G. RIEKERT, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, BASIN AND AREA PLANNING DIVISION, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am pleased to appear before your committee today to support the five watershed projects under consideration, Brundage Watershed in Idaho; Elk Creek, Kansas; Calapooya Creek, Oregon; South Fork Licking River, Ohio; and Los Olmos, Tex. These projects have been prepared in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, Public Law 83-566. I have with me Mr. Edward Riekert, Assistant Director, who will assist me and provide a brief technical explanation of each project.

As with all watershed projects of the Soil Conservation Service these five projects were initiated by local units of government and other sponsoring organizations. The project applications for assistance were passed through the offices of the Governors to assure consistency with State plans and programs.

Watershed projects are developed by teams that cooperate with local conservation districts, county gc ernments, and other local entities. Local steering committees are generally formed to give guidance to the planners and help establish planning objectives, establish priorities, and help select the final plan. Many times sponsors provide actual resources—in services or dollars—to aid the planning effort itself.

This administration has been reassessing the Federal role in water development and the procedures by which projects are formulated. It is our position that national economic development is the appropriate objective to guide the formulation of water resources projects in which the Federal Government participates.

Generally, we will recommend the plan that produces the greatest net ecnomic benefits unless other factors warrant an exception. In fact, exceptions have been granted by the Secretary of Agriculture for four of the projects for your consideration today. The NED plan was selected for implementation by the sponsors in the Los Olmos Watershed plan. The Brundage Watershed and Calapooya Creek plans provide for reduced Federal outlays compared to the NED plans. The Elk Creek and South Fork Licking River plans include a small additional increment of Federal cost to provide additional benefits to the environment.

It is also our policy that direct beneficiaries should bear a substantial burden of the costs of services they receive from water projects, and that services should be provided by the public or private organizations that can provide them at the lowest real cost. Federal water project planners should, of course, give full consideration to local, State, and international concerns as they help develop projects; but features which benefit non-Federal interests should be paid for by those interests.

The watershed program administered by the Soil Conservation Service is compatible with these concepts. Watershed projects are not direct Federal undertakings. They are initiated by local sponsoring organizations. In addition, State and local entities participate financially in a substantial manner. The amount of participation varies by purpose. For flood prevention, local sponsors provide all landrights and will operate and maintain the completed facilities.

The Federal Government pays the construction cost in accordance with Public Law 83-566. At least 50 percent of any cost allocated to recreation are paid by project sponsors, including land-

rights. For drainage and irrigation, sponsors must provide at least 50 percent of the construction cost and provide all landrights required.

During the next few years we will be giving highest priority to planning projects that emphasize erosion control, flood prevention, and water conservation. We will continue to encourage multiple-purpose projects to make optimum use of construction sites, but expect the primary purpose to be those mentioned.

For a detailed explanation of the five projects being considered, I will now defer to Mr. Riekert.

Senator ABDNOR. Mr. Riekert, we are happy to have you here.

Mr. RIEKERT. It is a pleasure to be here.

In reference to the time, I should submit this additional material for the record.

Senator ABDNOR. Fine. [See pp. 25.]

Mr. RIEKERT. I will proceed to any questions that you may have.

Senator ABDNOR. Last year Congress more or less mandated that we take up 20 watershed projects. Isn't that right?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct.

Senator ABDNOR. Those 20 have all been more or less designated and selected, have they not and are under way?

Mr. NELSON. That is right.

Senator ABDNOR. What happens to those projects and others will depend on Appropriations Committee action and I don't know where they will end up. But there are a certain number of new starts.

Mr. NELSON. Apparently there is language in the Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1984 for 20 more.

Senator ABDNOR. So these five projects are certainly eligible to come out of committee? Are there others submitted from the Department?

Mr. NELSON. There is existing a pool of other projects which have been approved and are awaiting construction starts. These projects will compete along with those others for the construction starts available next year.

Senator ABDNOR. Senator Bentsen, a very active participant in this committee on water matters has arrived and I would like to call on him.

Senator BENTSEN. Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman.

I am delighted to see that we have Congressman de la Garza here, who represents the district I once represented in the U.S. Congress. He is a very able chairman of the Agriculture Committee in the House, a long time, very close friend of mine. He is here to testify on the Los Olmos Creek Watershed plan, Mr. Chairman, which I have intimate knowledge of and certainly he does.

We are both born and reared in that particular area, This is one that has had some devastating damage on Rio Grande City.

At your convenience, Mr. Chairman, I will be delighted to have him testify on this.

Senator ABDNOR. We are looking forward to it. I have a few more questions for the present witnesses.

Will there be other proposals coming up?

Mr. RIEKERT. For approval by this subcommittee?

Senator ABDNOR. Yes.

Mr. RIEKERT. In 1984, we plan anywhere from about five to seven additional projects may be ready for approval by this committee.

Senator ABDNOR. How about construction? Do you have them ready for construction? Will you be selecting the 20 that will go in the 1984 budget?

Mr. RIEKERT. We will be selecting the 20 as they become ready for operations. We have preliminary lists now but they are in the tentative stage.

Senator ABDNOR. Thank you, very much. We appreciate your testifying today. Thank you, very much, Mr. Riekert.

We now have Mr. de la Garza, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, a gentleman I have enjoyed working with all these years and as Senator Bentsen said an extremely valuable man over in the House.

I know this is one of your favorite projects, Mr. de la Garza.

You go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF HON. E DE LA GARZA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Bentsen, I will submit my prepared statement for the record.

Just let me briefly tell you the reason for my being here.

Early in the legislative career of my distinguished Senator, when he first ran for the Senate and I for the House from the 15th District of Texas, I was present on some occasions, in Starr County, when they talked about flooding from the Rio Grande River and flooding from Los Olmos Creek.

This was in the late 1940's. It wasn't until the early 1960's when his sucessor and my immediate predecessor, Congressman Kilgore, that a feasibility study was initiated. That was in 1981. It wasn't until about 1949 that they formalized their request to the Starr County Commissioners and two other associations.

Then, it was 1970, when the county passed a bond issue to provide the funds.

In June 1973, the Soil Conservation Service finally approved the development plan. From 1975 to now we have done the environmental impact statement and all of the other myriad of administrative procedures that we now have to go through for one of these studies.

I don't know how many more terms I am going to be in the Congress. But I would like to finish Los Olmos small watershed project as one of the things that I finalized as a Member of the Congress. Everything is favorable, Mr. Chairman. Of the annual loss to flooding, about $500 million, about 70 percent will be saved. It will provide some water, not only for aquifer, but for use in Starr County which has the lowest per capita income in my congressional district.

All of the legislation that we are passing here, such as the jobs bill, with good intentions doesn't sift down to that type of county where the work is seasonal and has no manufacturing.

So I am thinking that at least this would be one way to get some jobs to give us some credibility but the main factor is that it is a

needed project, beginning in Jim Wells County, where my family originally came from and then winding up in Starr County right on the Rio Grande.

Anything that you can do, Mr. Chairman, in cooperation with our distinguished Senators from Texas, Bentsen and Tower, would certainly be appreciated.

Senator ABDNOR. Thank you, Mr. de la Garza. You have a very persuasive statement.

Senator Bentsen.

Senator BENTSEN. Let me buttress what my good friend and colleague has stated. This is a project in an area with the lowest per capita income in the district. It is probably the very lowest per capita income in the United States. You have a total damage estimated at some $566,000 a year. You have a cost-benefit ratio of 1½ to 1.

When you see the kind of damage the Rio Grande City had back in 1960, again in 1967, I saw that personally, you know what that kind of devastation means to those people and with their low income, what it means to them in the way of economic hardship and how difficult the recovery is for them to bring about. For those folks to put a bond issue on themselves to participate and try to resolve this problem, I share with the Congressman his deep desire that we bring this to fruition and that we complete it; that we move along on it.

I want to do everything I can to assist in bringing it to culmination. I am most appreciative of your help, Mr. Chairman.

Senator ABDNOR. Thank you, Senator Bentsen.

I cannot speak for the whole committee, but from what I have heard, and seen, you have a fine project.

As I said, you do a very persuasive job of selling it too.

Thank you, very, very much.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you, very much.

Senator BENTSEN. This is the example of the kind of work that fellow does down there. That is why he has himself a lifetime job if he wants it.

Senator ABDNOR. I am sure.

Thank you for coming over.

Is Congressman Slattery here?

I think he is on his way. We may have to take one moment for him to arrive. We have one project left, Senator.

Congressman Slattery.

You timed that very well.

We are going to give you instant attention and turn the meeting over to you and tell you we welcome you to the committee. I know you have a project you are very interested in, the Elk Creek Watershed.

You go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF HON. JIM SLATTERY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. SLATTERY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the invitation to be here. It is very fortuitous, the timeliness as it were. I wish to thank you for inviting me to testify

in favor of the Elk Creek Watershed, an important flood control, water supply, and recreational area for northeast Kansas.

To reach this point has taken more than 5 years of cooperative work and study by Federal, State, and local governments. Their dedication was certainly worth the effort, and I want to commend local officials and the Soil Conservation Service for an outstanding job.

I support the construction of this watershed and respectfully ask for its approval by this subcommittee and the full Environment and Public Works Committee.

The Elk Creek Watershed is not a small project. When completed, it will cover 139 square miles, or slightly more than 89,000 acres. It will provide an estimated $1.8 million in annual benefits, compared to just over $1 million in annual costs.

It is important for residents of Jackson, Nemaha, and Atchison Counties. Six local government units worked hard to keep their end of the bargain so the project could reach this important stage.

Thirty-seven percent of the watershed will be funded at the local level, a firm indication of the support this project has among residents. A 63 to 37 percent Federal-local funding agreement is an excellent ratio.

Flood control will be the most significant benefit of the Elk Creek Watershed. Damage from floods in the affected area has averaged almost $995,000 a year, and has been particularly harmful to valuable crop and pasture land. Flood prevention benefits each year will average $1.19 million, according to estimates by the Soil Conservation Service.

In addition, the site proposed for the watershed is one of the most erosion-prone areas in the entire State of Kansas. Almost one-half million tons of soil are displaced each year. Construction of the watershed will reduce damage from erosion by more than $600,000 annually.

The project will also be a primary source of water for the city of Holton and for Jackson County. Perry Reservoir is the only existing impoundment large enough to meet future water needs in the area, but piping water from Perry into the watershed site is prohibitively expensive.

Estimates indicate the cost would be 1½ to 2 times as much as the cost of water stored in the watershed. The multiple purpose structure near Holton will be a valuable addition to the fine recreational areas in northeast Kansas and should be an economic boon to nearby areas.

To sum up, the Elk Creek Watershed will be a valuable asset to northeast Kansas and particularly to residents of Jackson, Nemaha, and Atchison Counties. The watershed will serve many purposes and deserves the endorsement of this subcommittee.

I respectfully request that funding be approved.

Thank you again for the privilege of asking for my comments on this most important project.

Senator ABDNOR. Thank you, Congressman Slattery, for coming over.

The cost-benefit ratio is extremely high for Elk Creek. It is a very fine project. As a matter of fact, we have had what appeared to me to be excellent projects before us today.

I intend to suggest that this subcommittee recommend to the full committee as soon as we can and, hopefully, sometime this month submit it for their approval. I cannot tell you what the committee will do.

I am sure it will be, for the most part, impressed with the projects and, hopefully, we can see some action come about.

We thank you for coming over. It is a long trip over here. But it is very needed testimony.

We thank you, very much. If you care to have any people back home submit anything for the record, we would keep the record open for several days. You can call them. They are welcome to do so.

With that, we thank you for coming.

Mr. SLATTERY. We appreciate it. We appreciate your thoughtful consideration.

Thank you, very much.

Senator ABDNOR. I think that covers our witness list.

Is there anyone else who wanted to appear?

If not, we stand in adjournment.

[Whereupon, at 2:55 p.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

[Statements and other material submitted for the record follow:]

STATEMENT

THE HONORABLE JOHN R. KASICH (Ohio-12)

Subcommittee on Water Resources
Commitee on Environment and Public Works
United States Senate

July 12, 1983

Mr. Chairman: It is, indeed, a privilege to appear with my distinguished colleague, Congressman Clarence E. Miller, before your Subcommittee, this afternoon, in support of the South Fork Licking River Watershed Project. It is also my distinct pleasure to welcome the officers of the South Fork Licking Watershed Conservancy District who have traveled to Washington to affirm their support for this project. Their appearance, here, culminates over 14 years of careful planning and preparation for this flood control project and a testament to the benefits it will provide to the citizens of Licking, Fairfield and Perry Counties of Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, once completed, this project will affect over 180,000 acres of land and will control serious flooding along Raccoon Creek and the South Fork of the Licking River. Plans call for extensive flood control measures and recreational improvements which, will, no doubt, reduce crop damage, protect residences, prevent further soil erosion and sediment damage and contribute greatly to the environmental quality of the area. The project will have no effect or threaten endangered species or wetlands. Careful attention has been given to retaining the cultural and environmental resources by providing waterfowl and aquatic habitats, acres of water for boating and fishing and land for other other recreational facilities; as well as the practical aspects of creating flood prevention benefits for over 450 homes and 35 businesses and reduction of water damage to pasture and croplands previously affecged by continued flooding. Stream erosion will be minimized by obstruction removal and watershed protection will be achieved through the application of planned land treatment under an on-going program.

These are only a few of the benefits this project will establish for the citizens of these affected Central Ohio communities and I know, first-hand, of the tremendous local interest in the construction of this project. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the plan being considered by the Subcommittee, today, has been in the planning stages for many, many years. The proposal has been prepared under the provisions of the USDA's Small Watershed Program and has been refined within the new federal cost-benefit ratio guidelines. I respectfully request the Subcommittee's authorization for this project.

I thank you for the time you have afforded me to testify before your Subcommittee on this matter of vital importance to my Congressional District.

SOUTH LICKING WATERSHED Conservancy District

July 12, 1983

Statement of South Licking Conservancy District before the Senate Water Resources Subcommittee.

The South Licking Watershed Conservancy District was formed in 1969 following the devastating flood of 1959. The district was formed by the Conservancy Court, made up of the Common Pleas Court Judges from Licking, Fairfield, and Perry Counties, OHio, following the presentation of petitions from the freeholders in the district.

The Conservancy District directors through PL 566 have been working since 1969 to develop flood control plans for the South Fork of Licking River and Raccoon Creek. The project will benefit 180,000 acres in Licking Fairfield, and Perry Counties. The project will reduce estimated average annual flood damages of $101,149 to crops, pastures, and related agricultural properties. Direct damages to transportation facilities including Interstate Highway 70 and urban properties are estimated to be $298,567. Approximately 8,355 acres, 449 dwellings, and 35 businesses are affected by flooding in the watershed annually.

The goals of the sponsors are:

1. Floodwater damage reduction for agricultural, commercial, industrial, and residential areas.
2. Erosion and sediment damage reduction.
3. Improved agricultural water management.
4. Recreation area development.
5. Improved appearance of the natural environment.

Primary sponsors of the project since its inception include the following:

1. South Licking Watershed Conservancy District
2. Licking County Soil and Water Conservation District
3. Fairfield County Soil and Water Conservation District
4. Perry County Soil and Water Conservation District
5. Licking County Commissioners
6. Fairfield County Commissioners
7. Perry County Commissioners
8. Newark Area Chamber of Commerce

Local support for the project has developed because of the unique combination of benefits the project will provide to both urban and agricultural areas, while providing opportunities for public recreation, as well. Enthusiasm has been maintained because of a strong appraisal base from which to develop the local share of project funding. Support remains strong among local elected officials as evidenced by nearly 80 mayors, township trustees, and county commissioners in attendance at a recent update meeting.

The Conservancy District directors have been meeting monthly since the formation of the Conservancy District in 1969. They have reported progress to the Conservancy Court annually. They have levied administrative assessments within the watershed for interim operations.

The Conservancy District has endeavored to keep the public informed of the plan's progress through a vigorous publicity effort. Countless time and effort has gone into the development of the plan to date.

The directors and staff of the South Licking Watershed Conservancy District, along with primary sponsors listed above, feel that the project is vital to the economic and environmental well being of the project area. They are committed to its eventual installation.

South Licking Watershed Conservancy District Directors

John E. Hankinson

John E. Hankinson, Chairman
4502 Worthington Road
Alexandria, Ohio 43001

John H. Weaver

John H. Weaver, Director
1596 W. Main Street
Newark, Ohio 43055

Wendell Hartshorn

Wendell Hartshorn, Director
3858 Hebron Road SE
Hebron, Ohio 43025

Gordon C. Postle

Gordon C. Postle, Secretary-Treasurer
799 Hebron Road
Newark, Ohio 43056

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

DOUGLAS COUNTY

DOUG ROBERTSON BRUCE LONG BILL VIAN

Courthouse – Roseburg, Oregon 97470 – (503) 672-3311

July 12, 1983

Senator James Abnor, Chairman
Subcommittee on Water Resources
Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works

TESTIMONY
CALAPOOYA CREEK PROJECT

Douglas County government has been working to alleviate many of the water problems facing our area since 1955. Virtually every winter, flooding occurs on most of the tributary creeks and streams during the winter months, only to be followed by severe water shortages during the summer. Our county government has established a Water Resources Department for the primary purpose of addressing and correcting these problems.

I would like to point out to the Committee Members that our local government is unique from most county governments in one respect--- we have not had an attitude of "Let the Feds Do It". Instead, we believe that Douglas County government should pull its own weight, as much as possible. Four years ago, as an example, we constructed a small reservoir about 30 miles south of the Calapooya with 11,750 acre feet of water storage in order to relieve critical municipal and agricultural needs. This water enhancement project was built entirely with local dollars.

However, we have come to a point financially where we must ask for your help...at least in part...to construct a water impoundment in northern Douglas County. An integral part of our county-wide

water enhancement program requires the completion of the Calapooya Project. For more than 16 years, we have worked with the SCS to bring this project to you today. Douglas County government has borne most of the costs to date for core drilling, aerial topography and hydrologic studies to ensure that this water project before you is the best investment in the Calapooya Watershed.

Presently, there is a lack of available water for industrial and municipal growth in the northern part of our county. Over 60% of all irrigation in this area is discontinued each summer because of water shortages. No longer is the Calapooya a major producer of summer anadromous fish because of extremely low flows which create deadly high water temperatures for fish life.

Although small, the 12,750 acre foot Calapooya Project will allow irrigation for farming for a distance of almost 18 miles downstream from the reservoir site. A total of 2,865 acres of farm land could be irrigated out of which 860 acres is classified as prime row crop soils. Since agriculture is our number two industry, the increased production of farm crops from irrigation would bear significant economic results.

Besides its importance to the agricultural industry, water from this project is also needed to ensure a reliable supply of both domestic and industrial water as well as revitalizing instream habitats for anadromous fish. Secondary purposes of the project, such as flood control, recreation and land conservation further enhance the value of a water impoundment of the Calapooya. And, as the proposed watershed practices contained in this project are implemented, winter erosion of valuable farmlands will be greatly diminished.

A few years ago, Douglas County government funded an evaluation of three small SCS projects in Oregon for the purpose of examining the estimated benefits of PL-566 Projects as compared to measured actual benefits ten years after project completion. One finding of this study was that recreation is an excellent long-term investment for both the local sponsor and the Federal Government. Indeed, recreation of the type anticipated in the Calapooya Project will provide jobs and a broader economic base in the northern part of Douglas County. Even though this project is heartily supported by our farmers, merchants and general citizenry...with virtually no opposition from anyone..., I have made this special trip to testify at your hearing simply for the purpose of emphasizing the importance of the Calapooya Project to Douglas County. As you are aware, our local financial participation is approximately 58% of the project's costs. We are hopeful that today you will act favorably on the Soil Conservation Service's recommendations and fund the remaining 32% of the costs necessary to construct our much-needed Calapooya Project.

Bruce Long

J.B. Long, Commissioner

JBL/jr

Presented to: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
Sub Committee on Water Resources

Dated: July 12, 1983

We, the Board of Directors of the Calapooya Water Control District, thank you for the opportunity to present our testimony during your consideration of the Calapooya Creek watershed project.

The Calapooya Water Control District is one of four local sponsors for this project. Our District evolved from the efforts of many individuals dating back to about 1967 when a committee was formed to coordinate an effort to address the water resource needs of our area. The District Board is comprised of 9 Board members, most of whom have willingly served for many years, and represent about 3,500 people in a rural setting in southwestern Oregon.

While this project may be formally referred to as the Calapooya Creek Watershed Project, in essence you are considering the construction of the 12,750 acre-foot Pollock Creek Dam and reservoir. This project has been selected after consideration of many alternatives. The project will provide for irrigation, flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, recreation, and land conservation. We would like to point out that approximately 58 percent of the project cost will be financed by the local sponsors.

At present, the generally low natural flow of the streams in the vicinity of this project allow about 860 acres of land to be reliably managed for irrigation. With this project, an additional 2,105 acres of land will have a reliable source of water for irrigation, or about 2.5 times that at present. The water releases to the stream will provide for increased flow which will improve fish and wildlife habitat, and aesthetics.

Flooding of farmland often is extensive in some years. While this project has relatively minor flood control features, it is a start and is an integral part of the County's water management program.

When undertaking a project such as this, we must consider our needs for many years in the future. Douglas County and the City of Oakland intend to purchase a total of 2,270 acre-feet of water for municipal and industrial use. If our area is to grow and develop as planned, we need this additional water. Diversification of our local economy is of concern to us. Inviting companies to locate in our area will require us to demonstrate that we have the necessary supporting services, water supply being a primary concern.

The recreational features associated with this project will be very desirable. The reservoir being nearly adjacent to Interstate Highway No. 5, the major north-south route of the west coast, there is a vast potential for recreational exposure to the thousands of tourists from many areas of the country that travel this highway annually. The benefit of this recreation goes beyond that of enjoyment for those recreating. It is a stimulant to our local economy in providing support services such as food, lodging, and recreational supplies.

The benefits of this practical water development project to the people of Douglas County would be very significant. Agricultural production will double on newly irrigated lands. In many cases, this will allow struggling family farms to survive and prosper. The economic stability of our recession sensitive, timber based economy would be improved by increased agricultural production, municipal and industrial growth and higher recreation revenues. In addition, land conservation treatment and flood control would reduce property damages, decrease irreparable soil erosion and improve water quality for steelhead and salmon.

In closing, we urge your favorable approval for proceding with this worthwhile project. This represents the culmination of some 16 years of dedicated effort of many local people in our area.

Sincerely,

Board of Directors
Calapooya Water Control District
Douglas County, Oregon

Ralf Hakanson, Chairman

Ken Shumway, Treasurer

George Wilcox, Vice President

Ed Wilkins, Director

Bruce Daily, Secretary

Harold Crouch, Director

Ron Hjort, Director

Creighton Baxter, Director

Don Knight, Director

TESTIMONY OF
CONGRESSMAN JIM WEAVER
BEFORE
U.S. SENATE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
JULY 12, 1983

THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR BEFORE YOU THIS AFTERNOON. THIS IS AN ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT HEARING FOR THE PEOPLE OF DOUGLAS COUNTY, OREGON. FOR OVER FIFTEEN YEARS THE CALAPOOYA WATER CONTROL DISTRICT HAS PLANNED AND PROMOTED THE CALAPOOYA CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT.

THE PROJECT WAS DEVELOPED TO PROVIDE WATERSHED PROTECTION, IRRIGATION, INDUSTRIAL WATER SUPPLY, FLOOD PREVENTION AND WATER BASED RECREATION. AS YOU KNOW, THE PROJECT INCLUDES A MULTIPLE PURPOSE DAM, TO MEET THESE PURPOSES. THE PLANNED PROJECT INSTALLATION PERIOD IS FIVE YEARS, WITH A TOTAL ESTIMATED COST OF $9,785,890. THE PLANNED LIFE OF THE PROJECT IS 100 YEARS. THE PROJECT ENJOYS A SOUND COST BENEFIT RATIO AND A COMPLETE REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. THE FINAL EIS DEMONSTRATES THAT CALAPOOYA HAS BENIGN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND THAT THE PROJECT IS WIDELY SUPPORTED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND CITIZENS AT LARGE. BECAUSE OF THE FIRM COMMITMENT OF THE SPONSORING WATER CONTROL DISTRICTS FOR THE CALAPOOYA WATERSHED PLAN, THERE IS NO QUESTION IN MY MIND THAT THE LOCAL COST SHARE PORTION OF THE PROJECT WILL BE APPROPRIATED WITH WATER APPROVAL AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

Douglas County continues to experience phenomenally high unemployment rates due to a very strong dependence on the depressed timber and housing industries. This recession has proven the importance of diversifying the local economy in an effort to avoid boom and bust cycles. But to do so means water for this area; Water availability for new industries -- water to expand and stabilize the agricultural base -- and water for recreation, to enhance tourism. All these things means long-term jobs. We've got to have them.

As you know, I rarely appear before this Committee. Far too often, in my opinion, the projects that are brought before this body lack merit or are otherwise flawed. I have, however, devoted a great deal of my personal energy toward moving the Calapooya Dam through Congress because the merits of this project are outstanding. It provides extremely high benefits to the community, is strongly supported by citizens in the region, and its costs are modest and appropriate. I have spent a great deal of time developing the Soil Conservation Service's support for this project, and have worked hard to obtain endorsement by the OMB. I strongly urge the Committee to expeditiously join those of us who support this project, and approve it as soon as possible.

Thank you for your consideration.

BRUNDAGE WATERSHED, IDAHO

The Brundage Watershed contains 45,077 acres and is located in the northeast corner of Adams County in south central Idaho. All creeks and streams in the watershed are tributaries of the Little Salmon River, a tributary of the Salmon River. The watershed is typical of the region, having mountains that reach 7,600 feet in elevation interspaced with valleys and meadows at 3,800 to 4,000 feet. The upper watershed is timbered and the spring runoff is diverted for irrigation from the numerous creeks and streams.

There are approximately 605 people living in the watershed, with approximately 174 of these people residing in the communities of Meadows and New Meadows. The economy is based on agriculture, with livestock and timber being the principle enterprises. Meadow Valley is the feed base for livestock between the winter range and the feedlot.

There are 55 ranches in the watershed that range in size from less than 50 acres to over 1,500 acres. They are all family-owned enterprises with an average size of about 270 acres.

Goose Creek drainage, the watershed's major stream, contains three developed bodies of water. Brundage Reservoir, with appoximately 2,900 acre-feet of water; Goose Lake with 5,700 acre-feet of water; and Twin Lakes with 600 acre-feet of water. These reservoirs are owned and operated by ranchers in Meadows Valley to store spring runoff for irrigation later in the summer. All three reservoirs are in the Payette National Forest.

There are now 11,105 acres of pastureland in the valley, of which 10,096 acres are irrigated. In the watershed there are 4,396 acres of well-drained soils and 5,700 acres of high water table soils.

Year-round recreation resources are abundant in the watershed. There is fishing and hunting in addition to winter sports, campgrounds, picnicking, and sightseeing. The Little Salmon River, Goose Creek, and the reservoirs are used for fishing, boating, picnicking, and camping.

The major watershed problem is shortage of late summer and fall season forage for beef cattle. This is caused by an inadequate water supply to meet the July, August, and September irrigation needs and by the low level of management the present physical facilities allow the irrigators to practice. The U.S. Forest Service has determined that the existing Brundage Reservoir Dam is unsafe and must be either breached or rebuilt to modern specifications. If the dam is breached, the water shortage will occur even earlier in the irrigation season and the reliability of sufficient water will be reduced. Other problems include a lack of good timber production management on privately owned woodlands that are grazed by yearling cattle, and tributary streams of the Little Salmon River that exceed the State's fecal coliform standard.

The Brundage Watershed Project has been planned to provide full season irrigation water supply, improve overall irrigation efficiencies, and improve quality of Brundage Reservoir fishery and wildlife habitat. This plan proposes the enlargement of the Brundage Reservoir to a storage capacity of 7,330 acre-feet, the improvement and extension of existing canals (including necessary structural components such as diversions and headgates) and the application of land treatment measures.

Structural measures include construction of a new dam at the site of the existing Brundage Reservoir. The dam will be approximately 53 feet high with a storage capacity of 7,330 acre-feet. The earth fill of the existing dam will be removed to bedrock and the existing concrete core will become part of the new dam.

The Forest Service plans four practices on Federal lands directly associated with Brundage Reservoir. They include seeding of approximately 20 acres of wetland vegetation tolerant to drawdown conditions, 6 wildlife islands constructed and vegetated to enhance wildlife habitat, construction of a public sanitary facility, and 3-1/2 miles of access road improvements between Brundage Reservoir and Goose Lake Campground.

Works of improvement on the irrigation distribution systems will consist of repair and/or replacement of deteriorating structures which presently have an estimated life of less than about 25 years. Approximately 112 new turnout structures will be required plus an additional 30,800 feet of new ditch.

The land treatment program consists of ongoing and accelerated technical and financial assistance to watershed landowners and/or operators. The program calls for technical assistance for the application of planned conservation practices which would not be installed with the present program, and financial assistance for the treatment of approximately 10,096 acres of irrigated pastureland.

The management of 820 acres of private woodland improvement would include removal of dead and diseased trees as well as harvest of mature trees. The land treatment practices planned include pasture planting of improved grass species on disturbed areas to maintain soil protection and the cross fencing of fields to facilitate the planned grazing systems. Land smoothing and leveling, water control structures, contour ditches, and border irrigation will result in improved irrigation efficiency.

The estimated average annual benefits occuring to the structural measures are $320,040. These benefits include reduced operation and maintenance and increased agriculture production. The land treatment program will increase the operator's management capabilities on their ranches, conserve their irrigation water resources, manage the forage with proper conservation for maximum production, and improve the economic base of the area.

With enlargement of the Brundage Reservoir there will be 7,330 acre-feet of water available for fishing at the maximum pool. There will be a conservation pool of 500 acre-feet that will provide adequate water to overwinter fish in the reservoir. The increased late season flows in Goose Creek will improve the habitat for rainbow trout, whitefish, and cutthroat trout.

BRUNDAGE WATERSHED, IDAHO

Size and Location -

45,077 acres in Adams, County

Sponsors -

Brundage Water Users Association, Inc.
Adams Soil Conservation District
Goose Creek Canal Company
South End Ditch Company

Purposes - Irrigation, Fish and Wildlife

Principal Measures - Soil conservation practices on farms and structural measures consisting of enlargement of the Brundage Reservoir and the improvement of the distribtuion system.

Annual Benefits and Costs	Average Annual Dollars Benefit (7 3/8 - 50 years)	Cost
Irrigation	320,040	243,100

Capital Costs	P.L. 566 Funds Dollars	Pct.	Other Funds Dollars	Pct.	Total Dollars
Land Treatment Measures	0	0	87,500	100	87,500
Structural Measures Irrigation	1,623,700	57	1,115,500	43	2,739,200
TOTAL	1,623,700	57	1,203,000	43	2,826,700

September 17, 1982

ELK CREEK WATERSHED, KANSAS

Elk Creek Watershed covers 89,036 acres and is a subwatershed of the Delaware River in Atchison, Jackson, and Nemaha Counties of northeastern Kansas. The watershed is approximately 25 miles long with an average width of 6 miles. The watershed contains 58,465 acres of prime farmland.

The only unincorporated cities in the watershed are Circleville, with a population of 178, and Holton with a population of 3,242. The watershed's rural population is 1,380. The Topeka metropolitan area lies 35 miles south of the watershed, Atchison is 24 miles east and the Kansas City metropolitan area begins about 50 miles to the southeast.

There are 495 farms in the watershed that average about 172 acres each. Principal crops are corn, grain sorghum, wheat, alfalfa and soybeans. Beef production is the major livestock enterprise. All operating units are diversified.

Major problems in the watershed are flooding, erosion, and grade instability. Approximately 8,825 acres are subject to flooding including 6,618 acres of cropland. Flood damage averages $994,900 annually including $282,400 gully damages and $413,400 crop and pasture damage.

Elk Creek Watershed is in one of the more highly erodible areas of the state. Soil erosion is a limiting factor in maximizing agriculture production. The greatest loss of soil is through sheet erosion on cropland. The average sheet erosion on upland cropland is calculated at 12.9 tons per acre per year with a range from 42.0 to 1.7 tons per acre. Areas affected by gullies (16,500 acres) are, or will be, used at less than their best agriculture productive uses. Scour has reduced productivity by 26 to 38 percent on 1,144 flood plain acres. Other problems in the watershed include a shortage of water based public recreation areas and a shortage of water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural use.

The project has been planned for watershed protection, flood prevention, grade stabilization, water supply, and public recreation. Ten years will be required for project installation.

Planned project measures include accelerated and associated land treatment on 8,000 acres of cropland, 5,800 acres of grassland and 2,700 acres of forestland. Farmers cooperating with conservation districts will apply the land treatment.

Seventy grade stabilization structures will be installed to stabilize grades and reduce flooding. Each grade stabilization dam will have a drop inlet type principal spillway constructed to maintain water at a specific elevation to control a gully problem and to store floodwater in a detention pool. Associated land treatment, including terraces and grass waterways, will be installed where necessary in the drainage area of the grade stabilization dams.

A multipurpose earth fill dam will be constructed to provide 3,872 acre feet for floodwater retardation, 750 acre feet for agriculture water supply; 1,500 acre feet for municipal and industrial water supply and 5,310 acre feet for recreation. Public recreation facilites will be provided for fishing, boating, picnicking, swimming, and other uses.

The installed project will reduce soil losses in the watershed by 16 percent. Floodwater and sediment damages will be reduced on 8,825 acres of flood plain within the project and 6,005 acres of Delaware River flood plain below the project. Prime farmland will increase by 1,518 acres.

Grade stabilization structures and the multipurpose reservoir will increase landscape diversity, improve fishery resources and provide additional feeding and resting sites for waterfowl. There will be 1,721 acres of water including a 520 acre reservoir for public water based recreation and wildlife management. Rural area development will be advanced through increased farm incomes and employment opportunities, decreased flood related expenses, and a more stable economy.

The major impact on water quality in Elk Creek will be reduction of sediment load. Pools created by dams will benefit impoundment oriented aquatic wildlife and decreased sediment concentrations downstream will benefit stream oriented aquatic wildlife.

Annual benefits for the structural measures and associated land treatment are expected to average $1,193,000. Of these benefits, $523,700 will accrue annually to reduced flood damage to crops and reduced gully erosion; $45,800 to other agriculture properties such as buildings and stored feed; and $37,400 to reduced flood plain scour and sediment deposition. The multipurpose dam will produce annual recreation benefits of $213,800 and annual water supply benefits of $124,300.

ELK CREEK WATERSHED, KANSAS

Size and Location - 89,036 acres in Atchison, Jackson and Nemaha, Kansas

Sponsors -

Delaware Watershed Joint District No. 10
Atchison County Conservation District
Jackson County Conservation District
Nemaha County Conservation District
City of Holton, Kansas, Jackson, County
Jackson County Rural Water District No. 3

Purposes -

Watershed protection, flood prevention, recreation, agricultural, municipal, and industrial water supply.

Principal Measures - Grade stabilization structures, multipurpose dam and recreation facilities.

Annual Benefits and Costs	Average Annual Dollars Benefit (7 7/8 - 50 years)	Cost
Flood Prevention	1,194,100	775,400
Recreation	427,600	253,400
Agricultural, Municipal and Industrial Water	193,900	41,300

Capital Costs	P.L. 566 Funds Dollars	Pct.	Other Funds Dollars	Pct.	Total Dollars
Land Treatment Measures	383,010	12	2,779,700	88	3,162,700
Structural Measures Flood Prevention	7,523,600	78	2,100,000	22	9,623,600
Recreation	1,571,500	50	1,573,500	50	3,145,400
Agric. Water Supply	89,900	53	80,700	47	170,600
M&I Water Supply	2,900	1	339,200	99	342,100
Project Administration	3,088,900	89	386,600	11	3,475,500
TOTAL	12,611,200	63	7,260,100	37	19,919,900

April 6, 1983

SOUTH FORK LICKING RIVER WATERSHED, OHIO

The South Fork Licking River Watershed is located in east-central Ohio. It consists of 180,364 acres in Licking, Fairfield, and Perry Counties. Nearly 88 percent of the watershed area is Licking County.

The largest city, partially in the watershed, is Newark with a population of 41,836 followed by Heath with 6,768 people. The total urban population is 39,553 and the rural population is estimated to be 18,921. The population of the area is growing quite rapidly, partially due to the very rapid expansion of the Columbus metropolitan area.

Approximately 60 percent of the watershed is in farmland. There are about 1,050 farms that average 160 acres in size. The farms are a combination of grain and livestock enterprises. Present land use of the project area shows 52 percent cropland, 25 percent herbaceaus land, 13 percent forest land, and 10 percent miscellaneous.

The economic and social conditions in the watershed are affected significantly by the industry around Newark and the proximity of the metropolitan area of Columbus. Many people live in the rural areas of the watershed but commute to the factories and businesses in Newark and Columbus.

The major flood problem in the watershed is the periodic flooding of crops, pasture, urban and industrial areas, and transportation systems. Flooding causes an estimated average annual damage of $112,800 to crops, pastures, and related agriculture properties. Direct damages to transportation facilities and urban properties are estimated to be $435,800. Approximately 8,355 acres, 449 dwellings, and 35 businesses are affected by flooding in the watershed.

Erosion rates result in average annual soil losses ranging from four to eight tons per acre per year. It is estimated that channel erosion consisting of streambank, gully, and road bank erosion is responsible for 18,950 tons of soil loss per year. Other problems in the watershed include sediment deposition in rural and agriculture flood plains and in ponds, reservoir, and drainage systems; inadequate drainage on about 42 percent of the watered cropland; and a lack of recreation facilities in a watershed that will be within one hour or less driving distance of 2,000,000 people by the year 2,000.

The planned project consists of conservation land treatment measures for watershed protection and structural measures for flood prevention, recreational use and environmental quality improvement. The structural measures and land treatment are to be installed over an eight year period.

One hundred and twenty eight conservation plans and 31 conservation plan revisions will be prepared with landowners for the conservation treatment and management of their land during the project period. Land treatment measures are planned to adequately protect 14,230 acres of which 9,530 will be treated through the ongoing program and 4,700 acres will be treated through the accelerated program. These measures include conservation cropping systems, forest land, pasture and hayland improvements, and related measures.

The structural measures are a combination of earthen dams, dikes, channel improvements, and recreation facilities. Two dams are planned for the project. One is for floodwater retarding and one is for floodwater retarding and recreation use. A flood prevention dike is planned along 0.3 miles at the south edge of Hebron. The channel improvements consist of 0.7 miles of channel enlargement, 3.3 miles of new flood by pass channel and obstruction removal from 18.2 miles of channel.

Recreation facilities are planned for two locations. Facilities of the Lobdell Creek Reservoir will provide swimming, boating, fishing, hiking, camping, and picnicking. The South Fork Licking River, from U.S. 40 to Hoback Park in Heath, will be developed for canoeing and picnicking. A proposed mitigation plan for the project includes wildlife planting and fish and stream improvement structures.

The accelerated land treatment measure will reduce soil loss, increase water infiltration and improve wildlife habitat and the surrounding environment. Erosion will be reduced on 2,880 acres of cropland, 1,060 acres of pastureland, 600 acres of forest land, and 60 acres of other lands by an estimated 34,600 tons per year. Sediment yield at the mouth of South Fork will be reduced 5,000 tons per year. Improvements will occur in farming efficiency, timber stands and forest management, water management, and cover conditions.

Installation of structural works of improvement and recreation facilities in the plan will produce average annual benefits of $1,409,200. The benefits will result from the reduction in floodwater damages of agricultural and urban lands, more intensive use of agricultural land, and recreation development.

Reduction in urban damages, estimated at $369,100, will occur at Buckeye Lake, Granville, Hebron, and Newark.

Average annual benefits to reduce flooding of crop and pasture land are estimated at $55,400. More intensive use from reduced flood hazard on agricultural land will provide an estimated $152,300 in benefits to the watershed. Other reductions in agricultural, transportation, travel delays, and indirect damages will amount to $81,000 in benefits.

The recreational facilities at Lobdell Creek Reservoir and on South Fork will provide additional recreation opportunities with estimated average annual benefits of $707,800. Redevelopment benefits stemming from project installation are estimated to be $43,600.

SOUTH FORK-LICKING RIVER WATERSHED, OHIO

Size and Location

180,364 acres in Licking, Fairfield, and Perry Counties

Sponsors

South Licking Watershed Conservancy District
Licking County Soil and Water Conservation District
Fairfield County Soil and Water Conservation District
Perry County Soil and Water Conservation District
Licking County Commissioners
Fairfield County Commissioners
Perry County Commissioners
Newark Area Chamber of Commerce

Purposes

Flood Prevention and Recreation

Principal Measures

Soil conservation practices on farms and structural measures consisting of one single purpose flood prevention structure, one multiple purpose flood prevention-recreation structure, 3.3 miles of new flood bypass channel, 11.9 miles of channel modification, and two recreational developments.

Annual Benefits and Costs 1/	Average Annual Dollars	
	Benefit (7-7/8)	Cost
Flood Prevention	657,800	350,300
Recreation	707,800	508,800

Capital Costs 2/	P.L. 566 Funds		Other Funds		Total
	Dollars	Pct.	Dollars	Pct.	Dollars
Accelerated Land Treatment	269,000	17	1,309,600	83	1,578,800
Structural Measures					
Flood Prevention	3,563,000	83	715,000	17	4,278,000
Recreation	1,918,600	51	1,850,600	49	3,769,200
Project Administration	1,397,600	89	175,600	11	1,573,200
TOTAL	7,148,400	64	4,050,800	36	11,199,200

1/ Based on April 1983 Addendum; 7-7/8% interest rate, 100-year project life.

2/ Price Base 1982

May 1983

CALAPOOYA CREEK WATERSHED, OREGON

Calapooya Creek Watershed is located about 150 miles south of Portland, Oregon, and 50 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. It consists of 157,300 acres in southwest Oregon's Douglas County. Approximately 39 miles long and 14 miles wide, the watershed is drained by Calapooya Creek, a perennial stream rising in steep mountains forming the eastern watershed boundary of the State.

The watershed population of 3,500 people is rural with Oakland the only sizeable community of 1,030 people. The major industry is timber and wood products, which provides about 40 percent of the jobs in Douglas County. Agriculture provides about 2 percent of the county jobs.

There are about 200 farms in the Calapooya Watershed ranging in size from many very small (5-7 acres) to over 3,000 acres. The average farm size is 300 acres. The five major categories of land use are: irrigated land, 2,140 acres; dry cropland, 1,390 acres; pasture, 43,420 acres; forest, 106,820 acres; and other 3,530 acres. All watershed lands are privately owned except for 13,250 acres administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

Present irrigation and municipal water withdrawals from Calapooya Creek often reduce summer flows to nearly zero. As late season demands increase, there is not enough flow and some users must be denied water In addition, Oregon law imposed minimum flow requirements on Caoapooya Creek to meet fishery demands.

About 860 irrigated acres in the watershed have water rights dated early enough to assure an adequate water supply for most years. The sponsors have determined a firm demand for irrigation water for 2,105 acres within the project service area. In addition, the sponsors have determined a projected need for this project of 500 acre-feet for Oakland and 1,770 acre-feet for Douglas County in the Oakland/Sutherlin vacinity.

Three water quality problems have been identified in the watershed. These include temperature associated with low summer flows, a high sediment content in Calapooya Creek, and a higher than allowable presence of fecal coliform on Pollock Creek.

Flooding is a frequent event in the watershed causing damage primarily to agricultural lands along Calapooya Creek. The agriculture lands flooded are mostly grass, hay, and pastureland. Flood damages are estimated at $156,430 annually.

This project has been developed for watershed protection, irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply, flood prevention, and water-based recreation. Planned works of improvement include conservation land treatment, one multiple-purpose dam, water-based recreational development, and associated onfarm irrigation and drainage measures. The project is planned for installation over a 5-year period.

The principal feature of this project is a 100-foot high earth dam at the Pollock Creek site. The reservoir will have a total capacity of 12,750 acre-feet with 5,460 acre-feet of net storage for irrigation, 2,270 acre-feet for municipal and industrial water supply, 3,985 acre-feet for recreation, and 430 acre-feet for fish mitigation. There will be a joint-use flood retarding pool of 3,600 acre-feet.

Associated onfarm measures will consist of irrigation and drainage facilities. Irrigation will be by individual systems, each consisting of a pumping plant, a delivery system, an application system, and appurtenances. Some 36 irrigation systems will serve 2,105 acres of land. Approximately 600 acres will need some degree of drainage for optimum production under irrigation.

Forty multiple-use management plans for land treatment will be developed and applied by private nonindustry landowners on an estimated 13,600 acres of forest land in the watershed. The Oregon Department of Forestry will prepare the plans, including reforestation on 400 acres, timber stand improvement on 1,000 acres, harvesting techniques and utilization, and marketing opportunities.

Nonstructural measures of the project include the use of information on flooding areas and soils data by the county in revised land use zoning, the monitoring of water quality in Pollock Reservoir, and the consideration of water conservation in the design of onfarm systems and in irrigation water management plans.

A recreation facility on the Pollock Creek Reservoir will include a picnic area, an open recreation area, swimming beaches, sanitary facilities, and boat launching and docking areas. As mitigation for lost anadromous fish habitat, minimum flows of 8-10 cfs will be maintained in Pollock Creek below the dam in November through May, and 7-14 cfs from May through October. As mitigation for lost terrestrial wildlife habitat, approximately 57 acres of new habitat will be developed and maintained.

The installation of project structural measures will result in average annual benefits of $817,800. Flood damage reduction benefits will be $10,180 per year. Other average annual benefits are: irrigation, $227,330; recreation, $325,180; municipal and industrial water supply, $205,030; and employment, $56,650. Enhancement of fish habitat will improve water quantity and quality in the summer and fall.

CALAPOOYA WATERSHED, OREGON

Size and Location - 157,300 acres in Douglas County

Sponsors -

Calapooya Water Control District
North Douglas Soil and Water Conservation District
Douglas County
City of Oakland

Purposes -

Watershed Protection, Flood Prevention, Irrigation, Municipal and Industrial Water Supply, Water-Based Recreation

Principal Measures - Soil conservation practices on farms and structural measures consisting of one multiple purpose dam, water-based recreational development, and associated on-farm irrigation and drainage measures.

Annual Benefits and Costs	Average Annual Dollars (7 3/8 - 100 years)	
	Benefit	Cost
Flood Prevention	12,100	6,520
Irrigation	287,760	253,100
Recreation	535,220	383,170
M&I Water Supply	254,870	146,450

Capital Costs	P.L. 566 Funds Dollars	Pct.	Other Funds Dollars	Pct.	Total Dollars
Land Treatment Measures	190,710	12	1,404,950	88	1,596,660
Structural Measures Flood Prevention	83,400	100	140	0	83,540
Irrigation	897,920	34	1,755,980	66	2,653,900
M&I	1,900	1	1,893,470	99	1,895,370
Recreation	2,046,590	50	1,981,000	50	4,027,590
Project Administration	1,103,080	95	61,500	5	1,164,580
TOTAL	4,323,600	38	7,097,040	62	11,420,640

September 17, 1982

LOS OLMOS CREEK WATERSHED, TEXAS

The Los Olmos Creek Watershed is located in far south Texas in portions of Jim Hogg and Starr Counties. It comprises an area of about 204,470 acres. The drainage area consists of numerous creeks and arroyos all of which have ephemeral flow. The watershed topography ranges from gently rolling in the upper portions to nearly level at the lower portion in the vicinity of Rio Grande City.

The economy within the area relies primarily on agriculture, with Rio Grande City serving as a market center. Rangeland is the prevailing land use in the watershed, comprising about 96 percent of the total.

There are approximately 150 farm and ranch units averaging about 1,350 acres in size, either wholly or partially within the watershed. The size of individual operating units range from less than 100 to more than 2,000 acres. About 98 percent of the agriculture land is owner-operated.

Starr County not only suffers from a large unemployment rate of 31.3 percent in 1979, but it is also within a geographic area that has the lowest per capita income in the nation of $2,960 in 1978.

The principal problem within the watershed is flooding from Los Olmos Creek and the contributing drainage area of Sandia Creek which results in damages to residents, businesses, agriculture properties, and other properties estimated to average $566,020 annually. Flooding on agriculture lands damages crops, pastures, and farm improvements. Flood waters inundate highly productive areas planted to vegetables and cause complete crops loss.

Flood waters create potential health hazards, provide vector habitat, and cause many inconveniences tending to lower the quality of life in the watershed. Residents of Rio Grande City and El Sauz who suffer from flood damages are affected by monetary losses, threats to loss of life and displacement from homes. A potential shortage of potable water exist in Rio Grande City because the water treatment and pumping facility are located in the flood plain.

There is also a need to provide better range management practices throughout the watershed. Much of the rangeland is overgrazed and indiscriminate clearing of mixed brush chaparral without wildlife considerations has removed unique wildlife habitat.

The recommended plan addresses the purposes of flood damage reduction to urban property and to agriculture flood plain lands. The works of improvement are one single-purpose floodwater retarding structure and two dikes, one at EL Sauz and one at Rio Grande City, to be installed within a four year period.

The floodwater retarding structure will be an earth dam with a principal spillway and plunge basin, two emergency spillways, a sediment pool, and a floodwater retarding pool. Both dikes will consist of compacted earth fill and will protect downstream development from a breach of the floodwater retarding structure. In addition, the Rio Grande City dike will protect the urban area from the one percent chance storm runoff from the area (376 square miles) not controlled by the floodwater retarding structure.

The recommended plan will reduce the average annual flood damages to urban property in Rio Grande City and El Sauz, reduce average annual flood damages to agriculture properties, eliminate the risk of loss of life in every building in the flood hazard area, and improve the quality of life and social will being to the residents of the area. The average annual damage reduction benefits would be $409,650 and employment benefits of $11,840. Habitat losses attributable to the structural measures will be compensated for by managing 686 acres for wildlife and vegatative plantings on disturbed areas.

LOS OLMOS CREEK, TEXAS

Size and Location

204,470 acres in portions of Jim Hogg and Starr Counties

Sponsors

Starr County Commissioners Court
Starr County Soil and Water Conservation District
Monte Mucho Soil and Water Conservation District

Purposes

Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention

Principal Measures

Structural measures consisting of one floodwater retarding structure and two dikes totaling 20,577 feet.

Annual Benefits and Costs	Average Annual Dollars Benefit (7 5/8 - 100 years)	Cost
Flood Prevention	580,310	397,390

Capital Costs	P.L. 566 Funds Dollars	Pct.	Other Funds Dollars	Pct.	Total Dollars
Structural Measures Flood Prevention	2,824,330	80	700,450	20	3,524,780
Project Administration	599,920	99	7,000	1	606,920
TOTAL	3,424,250	83	707,450	17	4,131,700

October 6, 1982

United States Department of Agriculture
Soil Conservation Service
P.O. Box 2890
Washington, D.C.
20013

JUL 2 6 1983

Honorable James Abdnor
Chairman
Subcommittee on Water Resources
Committee on Environment and Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Your letter of July 14, 1983, requested answers for the record as followup to testimony about the five watershed projects.

Enclosed are the responses.

Sincerely,

EDGAR H. NELSON
Director, Basin and
Area Planning Division

Enclosures

Abdnor - What effect would implementation of the cost-sharing provisions envisioned in S. 1031 have on local sponsor interest in small watersheds projects? What effect would these provisions have on the current projects in preauthorization stages? Would the effect be the same if substantial payback periods were allowed and if landrights, easements, etc., were allowed to count towards the local share.

Nelson - The cost-sharing provisions of the present version of S. 1031 apply only to projects of the Corps of Engineers. If S. 1031 was amended to include projects of other Federal agencies, such as Public Law 83-566 projects of the Soil Conservation Service, there would be a negligible effect on the interests of sponsors toward the program. Past studies of cost sharing on individual projects have shown that the sponsors do contribute significant funds to flood prevention projects. Local sponsors are required by Public Law 83-566 to acquire, at 100 percent local cost, all landrights, easements, etc., before project construction is initiated for flood control projects. Providing for a substantial payback period would not affect sponsor interest as Public Law 83-566 provides provisions for sponsors to obtain long-term Federal loans through the Farmers Home Administration to meet their financial responsibilities. The repayment period may be limited by State laws but can be as long as 50 years.

Abdnor - Please provide the Committee with the following information:

1. The current list of small watersheds projects in any stage prior to authorization.

2. A list of those projects which will be referred to Congress for authorization within the next 1-1/2 years. Please provide the following about these projects:

   A. Location and Congressional District.
   B. Approximate cost (Federal and nonfederal).
   C. Project purposes ranked by percent of benefits.
   D. Major structural measures involved.
   E. Whether or not they will involve impoundments.
   F. Approximate dates of transmittal to the Congress (if possible).

Nelson - The information is as follows:

PL-566 WATERSHED PROJECTS IN PLANNING

STATE	NAME	DATE PLANNING APPROVED
AL	BEAR-CAINE CREEKS	7/83
AL	HARRISON MILL-PANTHER CREEK	8/82
AL	KELLY-PRESTON MILL CREEK	9/80
AL	MOORES CREEK	2/77
AR	EAST FORK CADRON CREEK	7/68
AR	LOWER CADRON CREEK	7/68
AR	NORTH FORK CADRON CREEK	7/68
AR	TYRONZA RIVER	9/77
AZ	COTTONWOOD WASH	8/67
AZ	EAGLE TAIL MOUNTAIN	9/66
CA	LOWER SILVER CREEK	9/80
CA	WOODLAKE-ANTELOPE VALLEY	7/83
CO	LOWER LATHAM IRRIGATION SYSTEM	9/81
CO	WOLF CREEK-HIGHLANDS	7/83
CT	FARM RIVER	6/75
CT	MILL-HORSE BROOK	9/81
CT	YANTIC RIVER	12/66
DE	MURDERKILL RIVER	6/79
DE	ST. JONES RIVER	7/83
FL	EAST PITTMAN CREEK	9/81
FL	WEST FORK COLDWATER CREEK	7/83
GA	CASON BRANCH-DUHART CREEK	7/83
GA	SHOAL CREEK	8/82
HI	WAIMEA-PAAUILO AGRICULTURAL	7/83
IA	A & T LONG BRANCH	8/82
IA	BUFFALO BILL	8/82
IA	HACKLEBARNEY	9/77
IA	INDIAN CREEK-VAN BUREN (MO)	8/57
IA	MORLEE	6/79
IA	ROSS	8/82
IA	TWIN PONIES	2/77
ID	BRUNDAGE	4/79
ID	LOWER SAND CREEK (SAND CREEK)	5/65
ID	ROCK CREEK-BIG CANYON	2/77
ID	ROCK CREEK-EAST FORK	2/77
ID	ROCK CREEK-HOUTZ CANYON	2/77
ID	ROCK CREEK-OUTLET	2/77
ID	ROCK CREEK-ROY EAST	2/77
ID	THORN CREEK	7/83
ID	UPPER SAND CREEK (SAND CREEK)	5/65
IL	KINKAID LAKE	7/83
IL	LOWER DES PLAINES TRIBUTARIES	9/77
IN	MARIAH CREEK	8/82
IN	PORTER COUNTY-KANKAKEE	2/77
IN	WEST GOSHEN	8/82

PL-566 WATERSHED PROJECTS IN PLANNING

STATE	NAME	DATE PLANNING APPROVED
KS	DEER CREEK	6/78
KS	ELK CREEK	9/68
KS	ROY'S CREEK	6/79
KS	SOUTH FORK	11/71
KS	WALNUT-WEST CREEKS	7/83
KS	WOLF RIVER	7/69
KY	SOUTH FORK LITTLE RIVER	7/83
LA	BAYOU MALLET	6/72
LA	EAST CARROLL	7/68
LA	UPPER VERMILION BAYOU	6/79
LA	WEST FRANKLIN	2/68
MA	TEN MILE RIVER (RI)	9/73
MD	BIG & LITTLE ELK CREEKS (PA)	10/70
MD	FORGE BRANCH	7/83
ME	WEBBER POND	7/83
MI	BEAN CREEK	8/82
MI	BEAR RIVER	7/83
MN	SNAKE RIVER	1/80
MO	BIG CREEK-HURRICANE CREEK	8/82
MO	GRASSY CREEK	8/82
MO	LITTLE WYACONDA-SUGAR CREEK	7/69
MO	MISSISSIPPI COUNTY SPILLWAY AREA	1/71
MO	PERUQUE CREEK	2/77
MO	TROUBLESOME CREEK	6/72
MO	UPPER LOCUST CREEKS	7/83
MO	WEST FORK OF BIG CREEK (IA)	7/70
MS	BAYOU PIERRE	12/69
MS	SOUINLOVEY CREEK	8/71
MS	SOUTH DELTA	2/77
MS	TALLAHOMA CREEK	11/68
MS	TRIM CANE-SUN CREEKS	2/69
NC	CRESWELL	8/82
NC	FISHING CREEK	7/83
NC	RAMSEUR RESERVOIR	7/83
NC	SANDY CREEK	8/82
ND	ENGLISH COULEE	9/81
ND	MUSKRAT LAKE BASIN	8/82
NE	CALLAHAN CREEK	8/82
NE	EAST FORK MAPLE CREEK	8/82
NE	LOWER LITTLE NEMAHA	8/82
NE	MIDDLE BIG NEMAHA	12/69
NE	SKULL CREEK	7/83
NE	SQUAW-CAMP CREEK	7/83
NE	TURKEY CREEK (KS)	9/81
NE	UPPER LITTLE NEMAHA	1/71
NE	WOLF-WILDCAT CREEK	7/68
NM	TRUJILLO,MONTOYA,TIERRA BLANCA & RINCON	5/65
NY	CAYADUTTA CREEK	8/82
NY	DYKE CREEK	1/80

PL-566 WATERSHED PROJECTS IN PLANNING

STATE	NAME	DATE PLANNING APPROVED
OH	EAST BRANCH SUGAR CREEK	8/82
OH	SOUTH FORK LICKING RIVER	2/70
OH	UPPER KILLBUCK CREEK	8/81
OH	WILLS CREEK	8/82
OK	BIG BEAVER CREEK	2/68
OK	BOIS D'ARC-COWSKIN CREEKS	7/83
OK	CAMPBELL CREEK	1/81
OK	COAL CREEK	5/76
OK	DEER CREEK	8/81
OK	DRY CREEK	9/77
OK	LITTLE BEAVER CREEK	7/69
OK	NORTH DEER CREEK	8/82
OK	SAND-HOGSHOOTER	5/75
OK	SANS BOIS CREEK	7/70
OK	TURKEY CREEK	5/75
OR	CALAPOOYA CREEK	8/71
OR	JUNIPER CANYON	9/81
OR	MT. HOOD IRRIGATION DISTRICT	1/81
OR	THOMAS-COTTONWOOD CREEKS	9/77
PA	CHICKIES CREEK	2/77
PA	QUITTAPAHILLA CREEK	9/77
PA	UPPER TIOGA RIVER	7/70
SC	SALEM COMMUNITY	8/82
SD	TURKEY-CLAY CREEK	6/75
TN	MADISON-CYPRESS CREEK	8/82
TN	PORTLAND CREEK	8/82
TN	WHITE OAK CREEK	7/83
TN	WOLF CREEK	9/77
TX	BIG CREEK (DELTA CO.)	7/83
TX	BIG CREEK (TRI-COUNTY)	6/75
TX	CADDO CREEK	8/82
TX	ELM CREEK (RUNNELS)	6/73
TX	LOS OLMOS CREEK	6/73
UT	DRY GULCH-CLASS K-2	9/78
UT	DRY GULCH-HANCOCK COVE	9/78
UT	DRY GULCH-T.N. DODD IRRIS CO	9/78
VA	BULL RUN	8/82
VA	COPPER CREEK	7/83
VA	UPPER APPOMATTOX RIVER	9/77
VT	BARTON AND CLYDE RIVERS	7/83
VT	LEMON FAIR RIVER	8/82
VT	LOWER WINOOSKI RIVER	8/82
WA	NEWAUKUM CREEK	8/82
WA	REBEL FLAT CREEK	7/83
WI	RICHLAND CREEK	8/82
WV	HOWARD CREEK	7/70
WV	LITTLE GRAVE CREEK	3/57
WV	LITTLE WHITESTICK-CRANBERRY	8/74
WV	MIDDLE GRAVE CREEK	9/77

Projects expected to be referred to Congress by December 1984.

State	Congressional District	Watershed Name	Purposes by Percent Benefitted	Major Structural Elements	Any Structure Greater than 4,000 AF	Estimated Federal Cost	Estimated Local Cost	Date to Congress
California	10, 13	Lower Silver Creek	Flood Prevention-100%	4.64 miles of channels	No	12,000,000	1,700,000	March '84
Illinois	10, 13, 14, 17	Lower Des Plaines	Flood Prevention-96% Recreation-4%	4 structures 5.6 miles of channels 0.5 miles of dikes	No	27,000,000	12,000,000	Dec '84
Iowa	01	Indian Creek-Van Buren	Flood Prevention-27% Fish & Wildlife-45% Water Suply-28%	7 structures	Yes	2,700,000	2,200,000	Jan '84
Kansas	05	South Fork Cottonwood River	Flood Prevention-100%	11 structures	No	5,700,000	800,000	June '84
Louisiana	05	West Franklin	Flood Prevention-50% Drainage-50%	293 miles of channels	No	15,000,000	12,000,000	Aug '84
Missouri	06	Big Creek-Hurricane Creek	Flood Prevention-59% Recreation-7% Watershed Protection-34%	221 structures	No	9,000,000	2,100,000	Aug '84
	06	West Fork Big Creek	Flood Prevention-56% Water Supply-7% Recreation-4% Watershed Protection-33%	353 structures	Yes	13,000,000	4,300,000	June '84
Nebraska	01, 02	Upper Little Nemaha	Flood Prevention-53% Watershed Protection-47%	18 structures	No	9,000,000	2,800,000	June '84
Oklahoma	03	Dry Creek	Flood Prevention-100%	32 structures	No	4,700,000	600,000	Sept '84
	04	North Deer Creek	Flood Prevention-5% Water Supply-55% Recreation-40%	1 structure	Yes	3,000,000	10,400,000	Nov '84
	06	Turkey Creek	Flood Prevention-100%	11 structures	Yes	3,400,000	1,100,000	March '84
	03	Sans Bois	Flood Prevention-100%	12 structures 1.1 miles of dikes	Yes	7,000,000	400,000	July '84
South Dakota	01	Turkey Clay Creek	Flood Prevention-81% Drainage-19%	9 structures 9 sediment basins 65.5 miles of channels	Yes	8,200,000	1,800,000	Jan '84
West Virginia	04	Little Whiteoak-Cranberry Creeks	Flood Prevention-100%	3.6 miles of channels	No	8,900,000	5,600,000	April '84

Abdnor - If both the Senate and House Public Works Subcommittees authorized these five projects within 1 month and were immediately funded, how soon could or would construction begin on them? What factors effect this time period?

Nelson - As soon as Congress authorizes these five projects, SCS will immediately begin the final designs for the structural measures and the sponsors will proceed with the acquisition of landrights. It is estimated that, if given a construction start, construction could start in the Brundage Watershed in early spring, 1984. Construction on a small increment of channel in the South Fork Licking River could be initiated within 1 year. It is estimated that it will take about 2 years before construction could be initiated in the Calapooya Creek, Elk Creek and Los Olmos Creek Watersheds because of the time necessary to do the final design work on the larger structures.

Abdnor - If SCS is granted 20 Public Law 83-566 construction starts in fiscal year 1984, is it likely any of the five projects considered at this hearing will be selected for a start if authorized? What factors will affect this decision?

Nelson - We estimate that about twenty-nine projects will be ready for a construction start in fiscal year 1984. Our estimate at this time is the Brundage Watershed structure will be ready. South Fork Licking River will not be ready until late next summer and other projects may receive priority. The other three projects will not be ready during fiscal year 1984.

Abdnor - In the letter of transmittal to Congress from OMB which is attached to the Calapooya and South Fork projects, it was stated that funding for these projects would not be proposed until projects with higher priority benefits (urban flood prevention and municipal water supply for example) were funded. What practical effect will this determination have on the funding of these two projects?

Nelson - The SCS will encourage the sponsors to install the higher priority measures such as flood prevention, municipal water supply and water conservation first. Since the Calapooya project contains one multipurpose structure, it is not anticipated that funding would be delayed. Installation of the recreation facilities, however, may be delayed if higher priority work exists in other watershed projects. In the South Fork project, the sponsors will be encouraged to install flood prevention aspects of the project first. Again, installation of the recreation facilities at the multipurpose site may be delayed.

Abdnor - So far this year SCS has initiated 20 new project starts. Are any more projects starts likely in FY-83?

Nelson - Twenty Public Law 83-566 project starts have been granted for fiscal year 1983. Others will be considered as they become ready but it is not likely that more will be approved this year. We must continue our efforts to hold down Federal spending.

Abdnor - What is the average time from conception of a small watershed project to completion of the construction? Please provide a breakdown of the time involved in the major stages.

Nelson - The average time from conception of a project to completion of construction is about 12.7 years. The period from the time the application is first received until a planning start is granted averages about 1.6 years. Detailed planning takes approximately 1.9 years before a project is approved for construction. Final structural design and acquisition of landrights averages about 1.8 years before the first contract is let. The duration of the construction period for our completed projects has averaged 7.4 years. These averages are based on 575 projects completed.

Abdnor - What is the present status of the four small watershed projects (Little Calumet, South Zumbro, Mozingo Creek, and Upper Mud River) authorized by the Public Works Committees last year?

Nelson - The Little Calumet River Watershed, Illinois, was approved for a construction start on June 30, 1983. Funds have been provided to initiate construction this year. South Zumbro Watershed, Minnesota, will be ready for a construction start in fiscal year 1984. Mozingo Creek, Missouri, was a candidate for a construction start this year, but other higher priority projects were approved. This project will be a candidate if starts are approved in fiscal year 1984. Detailed designs and other preconstruction activities will continue on the Upper Mud River Watershed, West Virginia, during fiscal year 1984. Construction is not scheduled to start until 1985.

Abdnor - Are user charges ever levied at recreation facilities at SCS small watershed projects? If so, what form do they take, how are they collected, and who collects them? Do any projects actually show a profit from recreational user fees?

Nelson - The sponsors must limit admission charges and user fees to the amount necessary to amortize costs and provide adequate operation and maintenance. The fees usually are collected upon entering the recreation facility on a day use basis. No projects show a profit from user fees.

Abdnor - What percentage of those nonfederal dams in the National inventory of dams has SCS helped design and construct? How many of these dams should be structurally modified in order to meet accepted safety standards considering conditions that have changed downstream since their construction? Are most owners in this situation financially capable of modifying their own dams? Do you believe SCS has any responsibility to assist owners of these dams in upgrading them? Why or why not?

Nelson - Approximately 40 percent of the nonfederal dams in the U.S. Corps of Engineers national inventory were designed and constructed with SCS assistance. This is based on an SCS reported total of 25,564 dams in 1981 versus a Corps' total of 63,419.

We do not know the number of SCS-assisted dams that need modification because of changed downstream conditions subsequent to construction. However, based on data obtained from the Corps inventory we estimate that about 500 SCS-assisted dams would fall into that category. This estimate is based on the number of dams classified as deficient because of inadequate spillway capacity - usually an indication of changed hazard class.

We believe that most dam owners are not financially capable of modifying their own dams to meet accepted standards.

We do not believe that SCS has responsibility to provide financial assistance to those owners as long as the SCS assistance was based on accepted standards at the time of installation. SCS has no authority to control land use downstream of dams. This responsibility rests with the States and local entities of government.

Abdnor - How many dams built under SCS programs were considered unsafe according to the Corps of Engineers inspection program? Please rank the primary deficiency(s) cited for these dams. Are all dams constructed by SCS programs considered nonfederal?

Nelson - Of the estimated 1,930 SCS-assisted dams that were inspected by the Corps program, about 538 were considered unsafe. The ranking of deficiencies was as follows: spillway capacity, other, seepage, stability, structural, and operational. It should be noted that the dams inspected did not represent a random sample of all dams, but was intended to concentrate on those dams considered as high hazard potential.

Practically all dams constructed through SCS programs are nonfederal. The only exceptions would be those very few where SCS assistance was provided to another Federal agency. None of the SCS-assisted dams are owned by SCS.

Abdnor - Are owners of SCS program dams performing adequate safety related maintenance and surveillance? If not, does SCS have plans to strengthen its own programs in order to require owners (both present and future) to do better operation and maintenance work? If not, why not?

Nelson - SCS knowledge on the adequacy of maintenance and surveillance by the dam owner varies depending upon the program. For dams installed under its financial assistance programs (such as the watershed program), SCS requires the local sponsor to execute an operation and maintenance agreement which specifies the operation and maintenance requirements. SCS receives periodic reports from the sponsors on their operation and maintenance activities. Monitoring of these reports indicates that, in general, safety related maintenance and surveillance is adequate. If the operation and maintenance agreement is not followed, SCS can take action to enforce it.

For dams installed under its technical assistance programs (such as Conservation Operations) SCS assistance may end as soon as construction is completed. However, SCS does provide the owner with an operation and maintenance plan which recommends the specific maintenance and surveillance items to keep the dam in a safe operating condition. SCS has no plans to become more involved in the surveillance or maintenance of these dams because of its lack of authority coupled with the fact that this is the responsiblity of the owner and the State.

Abdnor - What role has SCS played to date in the Interagency Committee on Dam Safety (ICODS)? How does ICODS work affect SCS programs?

Nelson - The SCS Dam Safety Officer serves as the Department of Agriculture member on ICODS. Technical specialists of the Department of Agriculture have been actively involved with ICODS since its inception.

ICODS serves a useful role for SCS by serving as a focal point for the member agencies concerned with dam safety issues. Involvement with ICODS helps to unify and coordinate dam safety issues for the Federal Government. Agriculture involvement with ICODS has helped to make the Federal role more responsive to the numerous smaller, lower hazard dams with which SCS is involved.

SCS utilizes outputs from ICODS activities including current active subcommittee work involving training, technical guidelines, emergency action planning, etc.

Abdnor - Is the existing Brundage reservoir used for recreation? Will there be any recreation benefits if the new project is constructed? Is the improved fish habitat downstream of the project counted as a benefit?

Nelson - Presently the Brundage reservoir is used in the spring and early summer by fisherman. Because of the operation schedule of the reservoir, few or no fish are carried over to the next year. Each year the Idaho Fish and Game Department stocks about 4,000 catchable Rainbow Trout in the reservoir.

The installation of this project will provide a 500 acre-foot conservation pool that will provide adequate water to winter fish in the reservoir and improve the fishery resource. The Forest Service plans on installing minimum basic sanitary facilities to meet the needs of increased use. The downstream effects of water releases on fish habitat were evaluated, but detailed economic benefits were not analyzed. While there will be a resource provided for increased use for public recreation, no recreational benefits were used for project justification.

Abdnor - Did local sponsors of the Los Olmos project at any time approach the Corps of Engineers about their flooding problem? If so, why was SCS chosen to play the Federal role?

Nelson - The Corps of Engineers wrote to our State Conservationist in Texas on August 8, 1961, advising that since 12 percent of flood damages are to urban properties and 88 percent to agricultural, and since SCS has two watersheds adjacent to Los Olmos in planning, SCS would be the proper agency to carry out the Federal planning. In 1968 the Corps of Engineers made a brief survey of the Los Olmos Watershed for potential flood protection. On December 15, 1969, the sponsors wrote to the Corps of Engineers requesting that SCS plan the watershed using Public Law 83-566 authorities. The Corps of Engineers agreed to the sponsor's request and in 1974 SCS initiated planning.

Abdnor - Why is Elk Creek one of the most erdible areas in Kansas? Is Elk Creek more erodible than like terrain in other States?

Nelson - The combination of erosive soils, steep slopes, and a 36-inch average rainfall make northeast Kansas, Jackson County, and Elk Creek Watershed one of the most erodible area in Kansas. Jackson County is in the Northeast Kansas Target Area where high erosion rates are the major problem in agricultural production.

Very similar problems exist in Southeast Nebraska, Southwest Iowa, and Northwest Missouri where soils and slopes are similar.

Abdnor - Please explain why none of the grade stabilization structures associated with the Elk Creek project have little likelihood for public recreational use. It is likely they will be used for private recreational purposes? Why couldn't they be made available for public recreation?

Nelson - A few of the grade stabilization structures were identified as having physical potential for a fishery resource development. None of the grade stabilization structures, however, have likelihood for public recreational use because there is little demand for public recreation on ponds of this size. The many existing farm ponds in the area already fill the demand for recreation of this type. The grade stabilization structures will receive use by owners and others by permission, but total recreation use will be small. The grade stabilization structures will not be open to the public because recreation is not a planned purpose and public sanitary facilities will not be provided for these small ponds. Public recreation and public access is a planned purpose in Multipurpose Structure No. 36 only.

PREPARED REMARKS

THE HONORABLE E (KIKA) DE LA GARZA
CHAIRMAN
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

before the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Tuesday, July 12, 1983

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, it is not often that a Member of the House ventures over to the Senate, but I hope my appearance will underline for you the importance of this watershed project to my constituents. I certainly appreciate the opportunity to come before you this afternoon to outline some of the problems and benefits of the Los Olmos Creek Watershed Project.

Los Olmos Watershed comprises a total area of 319.5 square miles in Jim Hogg and Starr Counties. Starr County is in a region which has the lowest per capita income in the nation ($2,960) and suffers from chronic high unemployment. The economy of the watershed area relies primarily on agriculture with Rio Grande City, the largest community and county seat of Starr county, serving as an important market center.

There are approximately 150 farms and ranches either wholly or partially within this watershed. The watershed encompasses 2.7% cropland, 95.6% rangeland, and approximately 1.7% urban use. Much of the local economy is based on the agricultural sector and therefore agriculture directly affects employment in the area. It is highly desirable both from the standpoint of employment and in the interest of protecting the agriculture-based economy to authorize this project as soon as possible.

Also, the maintenance of the transportation system is of great importance to the local economy. There are approximately 50 miles of hard-surfaced Federal, State and county roads located in the watershed, and these roads are crucial to the transportation needs of the agricultural sector. As I am sure you are aware, a good transportation system is extremely important to agriculture --it is needed both to bring supplies and services to farms and ranches,

and to bring the farmers' and ranchers' goods to market. In addition to our highways, the Missouri Pacific Railroad operates lines into Rio Grande City with loading and unloading facilities located within the watershed area. This rail line provides access to national markets and any loss of this service in the event of flooding can be catastrophic to the local economy.

I would like to commend the local and State organizations which have worked so hard to bring this project about. The local sponsoring organizations are: the Starr County Commissioners Court, the Starr County Soil and Water Conservation District, and the Monte Mucho Soil and Water Conservation District. Also, I would like to commend the Soil Conservation Service for its valuable assistance on this project. As you know, tne counties will be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the facilities. The total estimated cost of this project is $4,131,700. The local share will be $707,450, and the Federal PL-566 share will be $3,424,250.

The total floodwater damages in the watershed currently are estimated at $566,020 annually. If this project is installed, the annual damage would be cut by $512,000 -- a reduction of more than 90 percent. The project will generate $11,840 in employment earnings, bringing the total annual benefit to the affected communities to $523,840. So you can see the benefit of this project to these communities is quite substantial.

The primary goals of the Los Olmos project are -- one, to reduce average annual flood damage both to urban property and to the important farm and rangeland; -- two, to increase public funds

available for other community services by reducing the amount spent on flood related damages; -- three, to provide new and expanded opportunities for public water-based recreation; -- fourth and finally, and certainly extremely important, to improve the community environment, health, and well-being of those citizens who live and work in the watershed area. Improved flood control will reduce health risks and enhance the infrastructure of the local communities.

Once again, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I want to thank you for the opportunity to bring this information to your attention and I urge you to approve this project and recommend its passage to your colleagues.

STATEMENT BY
SENATOR NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM
FOR
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES
SENATE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS
COMMITTEE HEARINGS

July 12, 1983

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to comment on the merits of the Elk Creek Watershed project in Atchison, Jackson, and Nemaha counties of Kansas. The Watershed Plan and Environmental Impact Statement which has been sent to your committee for consideration represents over 20 years of organization, planning, and cooperation between the communities, their residents, and the state and federal officials. Construction of this project will not only aid the local three-county area, but the entire plan will also have a positive impact on the state's efforts for flood control and water storage and supply.

As the project plan outlines, this watershed is primarily for flood control and water supplies in these northeastern Kansas counties. Flooding, erosion, and grade instability are major problems in this hilly, agricultural area. Elk Creek Watershed is one of the more highly erosive areas of the state, with an annual soil erosion displacement of 485,000 tons. Overbank flows or flooding occurs as often as twice a year, and generally not less than once every two years. These flood damages average almost $995,000 on an annual basis. Such expenses are a tremendous burden on the local municipalities and small towns, as well as a continual drain on the state's treasury. Farmers suffer agricultural losses, and all in the area have to cope with roadway and bridge damage which accompanies local flooding.

The watershed plan includes construction of a multipurpose structure, or lake, which will provide floodwater retardation, water supply, and public recreation. Seventy stabilization structures will be installed to retard sedimentation. Land treatment measures on 16,500 acres will further reduce soil erosion and sedimentation problems.

Other problems which would be alleviated by construction of this watershed plan are the shortage of water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural use and water-based public recreation areas. Water supply facilities will be developed by the city of Holton, with a population of 3,240, and a local rural water district. Recreational facilities on the multipurpose structure will be developed by Jackson County.

A final point I would make in regard to this watershed plan is the beneficial impact that its construction and implementation will have on a larger reservoir on the Delaware River, an important water source for eastern Kansas communities. The Army Corps of Engineers estimates that construction of this, and a companion watershed plan along the Delaware

River, would slow the sedimentation inflow and extend by 25 years the useful life of Perry Lake. State and national water-use plans and conservation efforts do not always mesh so conveniently, and for the benefit of an entire area, as they do in this fortunate situation of the Elk Creek Watershed plan.

I am sure that you will determine, from today's hearings and review of the Elk Creek Watershed plan, that this project is well thought out and its planning has taken into account the many factors which lead to solid community interest and support in the watershed plan. It is worthy of committee consideration and authorization.

Thank you.

Delaware Watershed Joint District No. 10

Atchison, Brown, Jackson, Jefferson and Nemaha Counties
P.O. Box 70 Holton, Kansas 66436 913-364-4309

July 5, 1983

Re: Elk Creek Watershed
Plan, Kansas

U. S. Senator James Abdnor
Chairman Water Resources Sub-Committee
Environment and Public Works Committee
Hart Senate Office Building
Room 309 2nd and C Street NE
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Abdnor:

We have been advised that the Water Resources Sub-Committee is to hold a hearing on the Elk Creek Watershed Plan at 2 pm on July 12, 1983. As Chairman of that Committee, we are sure you strive to follow your best judgment in deciding the outcome of all projects coming before you.

The Elk Creek Sub-Watershed is a major contributor of siltation above and into the Perry Reservoir. Installation of the project will greatly reduce this siltation rate as well as offer erosion and flood protection for the whole area. The project includes a multi purpose structure which will provide water supply for the city of Holton and rural water districts. Recreation also has been included in the site.

The Delaware Watershed District Board, under which Elk Creek is governed, and many local people have worked for over 20 years to see this project become a reality. Some of these local people and Senators and Representatives will be in contact with you to acknowledge their support of this worthwhile project. These people will be gratified to see their efforts become fruitful at last.

Sincerely,

J. Delber Braum
President

○